

U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
Public and Indian Housing

---

Secretary's Representatives,  
State/Area Coordinators,  
Directors, Office of Public Housing,  
Administrators, Area Offices Native  
American Programs, Executive  
Directors, Public and Indian  
Housing Authorities

Notice PIH 97-44(HA)  
Issued: 8/4/97  
Expires: 8/31/98

**PROCESSING OF GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 1997  
PUBLIC HOUSING DRUG ELIMINATION PROGRAM (PHDEP)**

1. **PURPOSE.** This notice provides instructions for processing grant applications submitted for funding under the FY 1997 PHDEP.
2. **APPLICABILITY.**
  - A. This notice is applicable only to those public housing authorities (PHAs) and Indian housing authorities (IHAs) submitting grant applications for the FY 1997 PHDEP grant program.
  - B. The term housing authority (HA) shall include PHAs and IHAs. The term Field Office (FO) shall refer to local HUD Field Offices or Area Office of Native American Programs (AONAPs).
3. **BACKGROUND.**
  - A. HUD announced it's FY 1997 funding of \$250,649,052 under the PHDEP for use in reducing/eliminating drug-related crime and associated drug-related crimes. A Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was published in the Federal Register/Vol. 62, number 100 on Friday, May 23, 1997.
  - B. Applications (original and three identical copies of the original application) is to be received by the deadline at the local HUD FO on or before Friday, August 8, 1997, at 3:00 pm, local time. A complete

listing of these offices was provided in appendix "A" of the NOFA.

4. **FUND ASSIGNMENT PLAN.** The fund assignment plan for distributing grant funds to be awarded under the FY 1997 PHDEP NOFA will be in accordance with Handbook 1830.4, REV-2, dated July 31, 1986.
5. **DEFINITIONS.** The definitions for the PHDEP are contained in 24 CFR 761 of the "Streamlined" Consolidated Public and Assisted Housing Drug Elimination Program final rule dated March 28, 1996. HUD will publish a new PHDEP proposed rule, for 60 day comment period, during August 1997. A final rule should be published on or about December 1997.
6. **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.** Eligible activities under the FY 1997 PHDEP are described in Section I.(c)(1)(6) and other sections of the NOFA.
7. **INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.** Ineligible activities under the FY 1997 PHDEP are described in Section I.(c)(10) and other sections in the NOFA.
8. **SELECTIVE CRITERIA RATING.** Selective criteria rating will be conducted in accordance with Section I.(d)(e) of the NOFA.
  - A. The number of points that an application receives will depend on the extent to which the application is responsive to the information requested in the selection criteria. An application must receive a score of at least 70 points out of the maximum of 100 points that may be awarded under this competition to be eligible for funding.
  - B. Scoring under selection criterion 3 will be completed by HUD local FOs that receive the applications. Scoring under selection criterion 4 will be completed by the Secretary's Representative for the area of the country from which an application originates. FOs are authorized to use one reviewer to score selective criteria 3 and 4.
  - C. The scoring of applications under selective criteria 1 and 2 and associated deliverables will be completed by a panel at a national PHDEP Application Processing Center (APC). Spectrum Consulting Associates and its subcontractor, Laurel Consulting Group under HUD contract # DU100C000184 was selected to provide these services. The APC will be located in the Washington, D.C. area. Further instructions regarding this process

will be issued.

- D. Applications, scored at the APC, with tie scores will be selected in accordance with the procedures in Section I.(e) (Ranking Factors) of the NOFA and other instructions. In instances where two reviewers at the APC have more than a 10 point different in their recommended scores, applications will be scored by a third reviewer. HUD will review all recommendations and determine final scores.
- E. In accordance with the FY 1997 PHDEP NOFA, after applications have been scored, HUD will rank the applications on a national basis. Awards will be made in ranked order until all funds are expended. HUD will select the highest ranking applications that can be fully funded.
- F. All awards will be made to fund fully an application, except as provided in Section I.(b)(4) of the NOFA (Reduction of Requested Grant Amounts and Special Conditions).

**9. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.** Distribution of funds will be conducted in accordance with I.(a)(b) of the NOFA.

**10. HUD REFORM ACT PROVISIONS.**

- A. The HUD Reform Act of 1989 prohibits any applicant from gaining an advantage in the competition as a result of receiving confidential information. The final rule, (24 CFR part 4) "Prohibition of Advance Disclosure of Funding Decisions," which implements section 103 of the Reform Act, specifically prohibits advance disclosure of the following:
  - (1) information regarding an applicant's relative standing;
  - (2) amount of assistance requested by any other applicant;
  - (3) identity of any other applicant;
  - (4) number of applications; and
  - (5) any other information contained in another application.
- B. HUD employees who have specific program questions, such as whether particular subject matter can be discussed with persons outside the Department, should contact the

FO counsel. HQs counsel for the program to which the question pertains may be contacted on (202) 708-3815.

**11. FIELD OFFICE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.**

- A. Directors, Office of Public Housing, National Office of Native Americans and Administrators, AONAPs will designate a Field Office Grants Administrator (FOGA) to manage the local FY 1997 PHDEP process.
- B. Directors/Administrators are responsible to manage and coordinate applications to the Secretary's Representative for scoring purposes. State/Area Coordinators may make recommendations to the Secretary's Representative.
- C. After awards are made Directors/Administrators are to act as liaison with the grantee in the performance of work in the grant and the ongoing evaluation of the grant progress.
- D. Grants Officers will act on the behalf of the Assistant Secretary in the negotiating and executing the functions involving the Department's FY 1997 PHDEP grants. Grants officers will complete and execute Form 1044 (award/amendment block 8 and 20) of the specific form and associated documents.
- E. The Department must emphasize, that ultimately it will be Directors/Administrators professional judgment, both technical and managerial, that will secure for the Government the objectives of FY 1997 PHDEP grants in a timely manner, with prescribed costs and a high level of excellence. Grant extensions to the FY 1997 PHDEP round is not permitted.

**12. HEADQUARTERS (HQs) ROLES AN RESPONSIBILITIES.**

- A. Office of Community Relations and Involvement (OCRI), Office of Crime Prevention and Security (OCPS) is designated to manage the FY 1997 PHDEP process.
- B. OCPS has provided in this notice attachments (appendix 1 - 6) regarding the FY 1997 PHDEP grant application process and other related documents to be used to complete the grant application staff training and application process. Additional instructions may be issued.

- C. OCRI will designate, in writing, a grants officer and government technical representative for the FY 1997 PHDEP and process.
- D. The timetable for PHDEP events will be carried out in accordance with paragraph 18 of this notice and other instructions issued by OCPS.

**13. FY 1997 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS.**

- A. FOs will assure that the FY 1997 PHDEP grant application process is conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in the FY 1997 PHDEP NOFA, related HUD regulations, this notice, ORI Grants Management Handbook 7490.01, relative OMB Circular (specifically OMB Circular A-87), handbooks, and additional guidance provided by OCPS.
- B. Applications will be submitted by the applicant to each designated FO in accordance with the FY 1997 PHDEP NOFA. Refer to the timetable in paragraph 18 of this notice.
  - (1) FOs will document receipt of the FY 1997 PHDEP grant application and provide written acknowledgment, to grantees, that the FO received the application indicating date and time of submission.
  - (2) FOs will FAX the FY 1997 PHDEP Application Master Log to OCPS, Room 4112, Fax number (202) 401-7965, Attention: Malcolm E. Main, telephone number (202) 708-1197, ext. 4232, (cc:mail address for Malcolm E. Main is PIHPOST2).
  - (3) In order to verify and validate grant application information, OCPS will request from each FO, via cc:mail, verification of the Application Master Log information.
  - (4) If a FO receives an application not in its jurisdiction by the application deadline date, the FO will ensure the following actions take place:
    - (a) Log the date and time of receipt in the master log;
    - (b) Transfer the application to the appropriate

FO within 24 hours of receipt of the application; and

(c) Notify the FO by telephone that the application is being forwarded. Send designated FO, via cc:mail, what actions were taken with a copy to the appropriate personnel as follows:

(d) The application is to be forwarded via overnight mail with a transmittal memo to PHDEP FOGA. The FO receiving the application will:

(1) Per instructions in this notice log in the application according to the prior FO receipt date and time; and

(2) Attach any appropriate documentation to the log.

E. Grant applications shall be screened and scored in accordance with Chapter 2 of ORI Resident Initiatives Grants Management Handbook 7490.01 and other guidance issued by OCPS.

F. In connection with ORI Resident Initiatives Grants Management Handbook 7490.01, the SMIRPH/MIRS Grants Management Module will be used in the FY 97 PHDEP grant cycle/process.

G. The FOGA will validate the correctness of all information entered into each of the required screens of the Grants Management Module.

(1) If the databases are not complete the FOGA will be required, in a timely manner, to make appropriate corrections and resubmit the database to the processing panel.

(2) The database must include the project summary on screen 7 at F3 and be no more than 4 to 5 brief sentences describing the activities supported by the award.

(3) The summary will be taken from the DRUG\*\*\*\*.DBF and used in Congressional notification. The FOGA will ensure that the summary contains complete

sentences.

H. For administrative purposes, FOs will retain one copy of the original FY 97 PHDEP grant application and send two identical copies of the original application with one score sheet attached to each copy with related documents to the APC. FOs are authorized to use one reviewer to score selective criteria 3 and 4. The following items must be shipped to the APC:

- (1) Transmittal letter. The transmittal letter must identify the number of boxes, applications shipped and listing of all ineligible applications with reason for rejection.
- (2) Application Master Log and Correctable Deficiency Log with any ineligible applications, identified and reason listed for rejection;
- (3) Application screening documents, and score sheets. A completed score sheet must be attached to each application with selective criterion 3 and 4 scores entered on each score sheet. Curable deficiency letters, corrections, must be attached to the application.
- (4) Organize and pack applications. Organized by HA Code sequence with HA Code printed in 2" high with permanent marker on outside upper right hand corner of each application.
- (5) Diskette of application information from the SMIRPH (public housing authorities)/and or MIRS (Indian housing authorities) Grants Management Module. FOs must ensure project summaries are entered, in English, with upper and lower case lettering
- (6) For APC management purposes number all boxes and place transmittal letter, Master Application Log, Correctable Deficiency Log and diskette in box # 1. Applications must be controlled and accounted for at all times during this process. All applications will be sent "overnight mail - contracted or non-contracted" to the APC. FOs must check with their administrative officer and mail room supervisor for guidance regarding this matter.

- K. Coordination and oversight of the PHDEP grant application process. FOs will:
- (1) Monitor and track grant applications by sending a urgent cc:mail to the APC that states "when" and "how" the applications were shipped and "expected arrival date"; and
  - (2) Send a copy of all cc:mails regarding this process to Malcolm E. Main (cc:mail address for Malcolm E. Main is PIHPOST2).
  - (3) Any violation in carrying out this notice may result in funding delays or repeating the scoring and ranking procedures.
  - (4) HQs, in conjunction with the Office of Public and Indian Housing Comptroller, and other offices will audit a sample of FOs and the APC to validate the review process.
- L. The scoring of applications under selective criteria 1 and 2 and associated deliverables by the vendor, will be completed by a panel at a national PHDEP Application Processing Center (APC). OCPS will manage this process. Spectrum Consulting Associates and it's subcontractor, Laurel Consulting Group under HUD contract # DU100C000184 was selected to provided these services. Additional instructions will be issued.
- M. FOs will ship application boxes to the Sheraton Washington Hotel, 2660 Woodley Road, Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008. Special shipping instructions: Sheraton Washington Hotel - Shipping and Receiving Department, HUD Grant Review, September 5 - 19, 1997, Attention: Deborah K. Tritle, Melissa Erie and Ray Johnson. Phone number (202) 328-2000.

**NOTE:** Applications boxes must arrive at the APC NLT September 5, 1997, 3:00pm EST time. Additional instructions will be issued.

#### **14. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.**

- A. A memorandum will be submitted by the Assistant Secretary, Office of Public and Indian Housing that includes a listing of the grant awards to the Assistant Secretary, Congressional and Intergovernmental



Relations, who will officially notify Congress.

- B. After Congress has been notified OCPS will notify FOs of a Congressional notification release date.

**15. NOTIFICATIONS TO SELECTEES AND NON-SELECTEES.**

- A. OCPS will prepare and forward, via cc:mail, selectee awards to FOs. Award letters will not be sent until:
  - (1) Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations has completed the notification of Congress.
  - (3) After Congress has been notified, OCPS will notify FOs as to Congressional notification release date.
- B. Applicants who were not funded will also be notified, in writing, at the same time as funded grant applications with scoring information. Applicants will be provided information regarding scoring (strengths and weaknesses) and other relative information.
- C. An original signature copy of each award letter will be provided to the Field Accounting Director (FAD) to reserve and obligate grant funds.
- D. The executed grant agreement will be provided to the local FAD.

**16. GRANT AGREEMENT PREPARATION AND PROCESS.**

- A. Form HUD-1044 with grant agreement and related forms will be prepared in accordance with Chapter 4 of the ORI, Grants Management Handbook 7490.01 and other instructions by OCPS. Directors and Administrators (Grants Officers) will complete and execute Form HUD 1044 (award/amendment block 8 and 20) with associated documents of the specific form.
- B. Execution of Grant Agreement.
  - (1) A standardized grant agreement will be prepared by OCPS and provided to FOs to assist in this process. This agreement will be provided to FOs as a guide only as related to contractual agreements and other agreements between HUD and the grantee.

- (2) FOs must verify award amount(s) and may place any special conditions, such as LOCCS edits or funding or programmatic restrictions necessary for compliance or performance of the approved award.

**17. APPLICATION DEBRIEFINGS.**

- A. After the completion of the scoring process OCPS will provide a copy of scoring sheets and related documents to FOs.
- B. OCPS's Drug Information Strategy Clearinghouse (DISC) will be available to provide feedback to those HAS whose applications were not approved for funding. For assistance or additional information contact Karen Molina, DISC, on (301) 519-5358 and/or the general DISC number on 1-(800) 578-3472.
- C. The DISC will maintain file copies of applications, scoring sheets and related documents.

**18. FY 1997 PHDEP GRANT PROCESS TIMETABLE.** OCPS, Offices of Public Housing/AONAPs FOs, and APC staff shall execute this process in accordance with the below timetable, and other instructions issued by the Department.

STEP	TASKS	TIMELINE(S)
1	A consolidated national PHDEP field training was conducted in 5 sites (Washington, DC, Atlanta, GA, Pittsburgh, PA, Kansas City, MO, and Los Angeles, CA) for potential grantees during	June/July 1997
2	FOs designate Field Office Grant Administers (FOGA) supervisors and provide OCPS, via cc:mail, the FOGAs name, cc:mail address and phone number to: Malcolm E. Main (cc:mail address PIHPOST2)	August 5, 1997
3	OCPS provide FOs HUD staff training materials guidance to screen and score selective criterion 3 and 4 and the FY 1997 Application Processing	

- Notice August 5, 1997
- 4 FOs conduct and document HUD staff training regarding the PHDEP NOFA, application process and that includes screening and scoring of selective criterion 3 and 4 Week of August 5, 1997
- 5 **FY 1997 PHDEP APPLICATION DEADLINE (FRIDAY)** **AUGUST 8, 1997,**
- 6 FOs start processing applications and scoring selective criterion 3 and 4 of applications (August 11 - August 29, 15 working days) (steps 6-18 through may be concurrent activities August 11, 1997
- NOTE:** FOs are authorized to use one reviewer to review selective criteria 3/4.
- 7 FOs FAX Application Master Log to OCPS, on fax number (202) 401-7965, Attention Malcolm E. Main phone number (202) 708-1197, ext. 4232 August 12, 1997
- 8 OCPS verifies FO Application Master Logs August 12, 1997
- 9 FOs send application acknowledgement and, if applicable, technical curable deficiencies letter provided to applicant August 12, 1997
- 10 FOs input data entry of applications in SMIRPH/MIRS Grants Management Module August 12, 1997
- 11 FOs start scoring selective criterion 3 August 12, 1997

- 12 Secretary's Representative starts scoring selective criterion 4. State/Area Coordinator may make recommendations to the Secretary's Representative August 12, 1997
- NOTE:** FOGAs must maintain and document control of movement of applications
- 13 **END OF APPLICATION CURABLE PERIOD AUGUST 8 - 26, 1997** (FRIDAY) AUGUST 22, 1997
- 14 FOs complete scoring of selective criterion 3 August 29, 1997
- 15 Secretary's Representative complete scoring of selective criterion 4 August 29, 1997
- 16 OCPS provides application shipping instructions to FOs via cc:mail August 29, 1997
- LABOR DAY - HOLIDAY** **SEPTEMBER 1, 1997**
- 17 FOs organize, and pack application boxes that contain the following: September 2, 1997
1. Transmittal Letter to APC
- NOTE:** The transmittal letter must identify the number of boxes, applications shipped and listing of all ineligible applications with reason for rejection.
2. Application Master Log and Correctable Deficiency Log with any ineligible applications -- identified and reason listed for

rejection.

3. Application screening,  
and score sheets.

**NOTE 1:** A completed score sheet must be attached to each application --- with selective criterion 3 and 4 scores.

**NOTE 2:** Curable deficiency letters, corrections, must be attached to each application.

4. Organize and pack applications.

**NOTE:** Organized by HA Code sequence with HA Code printed in 2" high with **PERMANENT MARKER** on outside upper right hand corner of each application.

5. Diskette of application information from the SMIRPH (public housing authorities)/and or MIRS (Indian housing authorities) Grants Management Module. FOs must ensure project summaries are entered, in English, with upper and lower case lettering
6. Number all boxes and place transmittal letter, Master Application Log, Correctable Deficiency Log and diskette in box # 1

- 18 FOs ship applications to APC. Boxes must be shipped and tracked by overnight delivery. Application boxes will be shipped to the Sheraton Washington Hotel, 2660

Woodley Road, Connecticut  
Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C.  
20008. Ship by:

September 2, 1997

**NOTE: Special shipping  
instructions to APC:**

Sheraton Washington Hotel -  
Shipping and Receiving  
Department, HUD Grant Review,  
September 5 - 19, 1997,  
Attention: Deborah K. Trittle,  
Melissa Erie and Ray Johnson.  
phone number (202) 328-2000.

- 19** Applications with all related  
documentation must arrive at  
the APC by:

September 5, 1997  
3:00pm EST time

- 20** FOGAs transmit cc:mail to OCPS  
that states "when" applications  
were shipped, overnight  
carrier's name, phone number,  
tracking number and "expected  
arrival date". Provide  
cc:mail to OCPS Attention:  
Malcolm E. Main (cc:mail  
address PIHPOST2)

September 5, 1997

- 21** APC staff administrative time:

A. Start organization and  
management of applications  
and data base for review  
process. September  
6-7, 1997 is a weekend)

September 5, 1997

1. Organize applications
2. Computer database  
system set-up, which  
includes analysis,  
validation of reports  
and awards, etc.
3. Organize training and  
panel/reviewer  
materials, etc.

- |    |  |                    |
|----|--|--------------------|
|    | B. Complete process  | September 7, 1997  |
| 22 | APC staff provides training, with documentation, to APC's supervisors, panel leaders, contracted reviewers, supervisors, and other staff with related responsible functional areas | September 8, 1997  |
| 23 | APC staff start scoring applications (September 9 - 19, 1997, -- 10 days which includes Sat/Sun)   | September 9, 1997  |
| 24 | APC completes application process  | September 19, 1997 |
| 25 | APC completes and validates data base entries into Grants Management Module, and develops/produces specific HQ analysis, reports and award package                                 | September 19, 1997 |
| 26 | APC transmits to OCPS: award letters, congressional notifications, required reports, analysis and other related documents  | September 22, 1997 |
| 27 | APC ships applications, with transmittal letter, applications, scoring sheets and related documents to DISC  | September 22, 1997 |
| 28 | Assistant Secretary PIH, approves awards   | September 24, 1997 |
| 29 | OCPS request Office of Budget reserve approved awards funds through the Program Accounting System (PAS)  | September 24, 1997 |
| 30 | Assistant Secretary,   |                    |

- |                               |   |                                    |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
|                               | approves and submits congressional notifications to Assistant Secretary, Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations  | September 25, 1997                 |
| 31                            | HQs -- Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations makes appropriate notifications  | September 25, 1997                 |
| 32                            | OCPS will provide list of final grant awards to FOs   | September 26, 1997                 |
| 33                            | FOs transmit award letters and grant agreements (Form HUD-1044) to grantees. A copy of each document must be provided to the FO local FAD in order to obligate funds. | September 26, 1997                 |
| 34                            | FOs transmit letters to applicants not awarded  | September 26, 1997                 |
| 35                            | DISC transmits copy of score sheets and related materials to FOs  | September 26, 1997                 |
| <b>COLUMBUS DAY - HOLIDAY</b> |   | <b>OCTOBER 13, 1997</b>            |
| 36                            | FOs execute grant agreements (Form HUD-1044) between HUD and the grantees   | October 31, 1997                   |
| 37                            | FOs enter activity budget line items into LOCCS   | October 31, 1997                   |
| 38                            | HUD submits award list to Federal Register. Document will be prepared by PIH  | 1st Qtr Report<br>October 31, 1997 |
| 39                            | FOs submit FY 97 PHDEP grant status report  |                                    |



	to OCPS	October 31, 1997
<b>40</b>	FY 97 PHDEP analysis completed by DISC to OCPS	November 10, 1997
<b>41</b>	OCPS provides FY 1997 PHDEP Analysis to HQs/FOs	December 1, 1997
<b>VETERANS DAY -- HOLIDAY</b>		<b>NOVEMBER 11, 1997</b>

## **22. REPORTS.**

- A. As in past years, to ensure that the program schedules are adhered to and that applicants are not adversely affected, the below listed monitoring/tracking report is required. FOs reports shall be, but not limited to, confirmation of the following:
  - (1) executed approval/disapproval letters to applicants;
  - (2) executed grant agreements (Form-HUD 1044);
  - (3) transmitted award letter and grant agreements (Form HUD-1044 to FAD; and
  - (4) input budget line items (BLIs) into LOCCS
- B. FO shall submit completion of the above status, via cc:mail, NLT October 31, 1997, to OCPS, Attention Malcolm E. Main (cc:mail address for Malcolm E. Main is PIHPOST2).

For further information on the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program contact Malcolm E. Main, Office of Crime Prevention and Security, Office of Community Relations and involvement, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, S.W., Room 4112, Washington, D.C. 20410 on (202) 708-1197, extension 4232.

/s/  
Kevin Emanuel Marchman  
Acting Assistant Secretary for  
Public and Indian Housing

Attachments

Appendix 1: FY 1997 PHDEP Grant Application Master Log  
Appendix 2: FY 1997 PHDEP Grant Application Screening Field  
Office Checklist  
Appendix 3: FY 1997 PHDEP Grant Application Correctable  
Deficiency Master Log  
Appendix 4: FY 1997 PHDEP Grant Application Deficiency Letter  
Appendix 5: FY 1997 PHDEP Grant Application Selective 3 and 4  
Score Sheet Instructions  
Appendix 6: FY 1997 PHDEP Grant Application Selective Criteria  
3 and 4 Scoring Sheet with supporting documents

**APPENDIX 1:      FY 1997 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION MASTER LOG**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

1.    The Master Log must be typed, ensuring that all items are complete.
  
2.    Attach a photocopy of the adding machine tape which verifies the total amount of funding requested.
  
3.    # HAS on column 1 and add page #s as required.
  
4.    FAX Application Master Log to OCPS on fax number (202) 401-7965, Attention Malcolm E. Main phone number (202) 708-1197, extension 4232, by August 12, 1997 (COB).

**FY 1997 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION MASTER LOG**

#	HA CODE	HA NAME	DATE	TIME	LOGGED IN BY:	FUNDS REQUESTED

Total funds requested by applicants \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Field Office \_\_\_\_\_ FOGA name: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX 2:        FY 1997 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION FIELD OFFICE  
SCREENING CHECKLIST**

**SECTION 1.        FIELD OFFICE GRANT APPLICATION SCREENING CHECKLIST**

HA Name: \_\_\_\_\_

HA Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Field Office: \_\_\_\_\_

Requested Grant Term in Months: \_\_\_\_\_

Total funds requested:    \$ \_\_\_\_\_

-----  
**SECTION 2.        FIELD OFFICE SUPERVISOR -- APPLICATION SCREENING  
CHECKLIST**

**SCREENING PROCESS**

TABS	COMPLETED		TAB IN APPLICATION
	YES	NO	
1	___	___	Applicant cover letter
2	___	___	Applicant data input form
3	___	___	SF-424 Application for Federal Assistance
4	___	___	SF-424A Budget Information, with budget narrative(s)/and supporting documentation
5	___	___	SF-424B Assurances
6	___	___	Form HUD-2880 Applicant/Recipient Disclosure/Update Report
7	___	___	First Selection Criteria
8	___	___	Second Selection Criteria
8A	___	___	-    Implementation Schedule/Activity timetable
8B	___	___	-    Personnel Position Descriptions (if applicable)

9	___	___	Third Selection Criteria
10	___	___	Fourth Selection Criteria
10A	___	___	- Summary of Written Resident Comments
10B	___	___	- Letters of Commitment (if applicable)
11	Certifications (In all cases refer to the NOFA)		
11A	___	___	- RMC, RC and RO certification
11B	___	___	- As applicable drug treatment program certification
11C	___	___	- As applicable law enforcement certification
11D	___	___	- Form HUD-50070 drug-free work place certification
11E	___	___	- Chief Executive Officer (CEO) certification
11F	___	___	- HUD-50071 lobbying certification
11G	___	___	- SL-LLL disclosure of lobbying activities certification
11H	___	___	- Debarment and Suspension Certification
11I	___	___	- Civil Rights Laws Certification
11j	___	___	- As applicable Law enforcement Records and Medical/Disability Information Certification

### SECTION 3. REVIEW OF FY 97 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION

		COMPLETED	
		YES	NO ACTION TAKEN
1.	___	___	Are all computations in the SF-424A (budget) and budget narrative complete and correct?
1A	___	___	Did the FO review the SF-424A and narrative to check for duplication of funds with other HUD programs? <b>ANSWER YES OR NO.</b>
1B	___	___	If yes, were any duplication of funds found? <b>ANSWER YES OR NO.</b> If Yes, explain what actions

were taken. (Review SF-424A and Tab 1)

2.    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    Did the FO verify the unit count? (Review Tab 1)
3.    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    Does the amount requested **EXCEED THE MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT PERMITTED?** If an error was identified, please explain actions taken in specific comment section below.
4.    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    Refer to the NOFA. As applicable did the applicant request funding for the activities described in the NOFA, to eliminate drug-related crime in housing owned by public housing agencies that is not public housing assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937 and is not otherwise federally assisted:
- 4A.   \_\_\_    \_\_\_    As applicable did the applicant demonstrate that the housing is located in a high intensity drug trafficking area designated pursuant to section 1005 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988; and
- 4B.   \_\_\_    \_\_\_    As applicable did the applicant demonstrate that on the basis of information submitted in accordance with the requirements, that drug-related activity, and the problems associated with it, at the housing has a detrimental affect on or about the real property comprising any public or other federally assisted low-income housing.

**SECTION 4.       FIELD OFFICE SUMMARY OF ACTIONS**

Were technical deficiencies noted:

Yes \_\_\_   \*\* No \_\_\_   \*\*(explain below)

Were curable technical deficiencies corrected:

Yes \_\_\_   \*\*No \_\_\_   \*\*(explain below)

**APPLICATION FULLY ACCEPTABLE:**

Yes \_\_\_   No \_\_\_   (Explain below)

Application screened by (print): \_\_\_\_\_

Verification of the above:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(FOGA Signature)                      Date: \_\_\_\_\_

As applicable specific comments by FOGA: (Use additional paper  
if necessary)



**FY 1997 PUBLIC HOUSING DRUG ELIMINATION PROGRAM FIELD OFFICE  
GRANT ADMINISTRATOR APPLICATION PROCESS CHECKLIST**

The following steps serve as guidelines for the FOGA to manage the review of the FY 97 PHDEP grant process. The FOGA must initial and date each step as it is completed in this review process and sign after all steps have been completed. This process must be executed in accordance with the timelines set forth in paragraph 18 of this notice.

All documents are official documents and must be complete and legible. The Master Application Log must be typed.

<b>STEP</b>	<b>DATE COMPLETED</b>	<b>FOGA INITIALS</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>
1	_____	_____	FOGA designated and provided via cc:mail the name/cc:mail address and phone number to OCPS
3	_____	_____	Identified screeners, reviewers for applications and data module entry person and other required staff
4	_____	_____	PHDEP training completed. Training attendance and subjects covered was documented on the FO "Training Attendance Sheet"
5	_____	_____	HUD reform act provisions form completed by reviewers
6	_____	_____	All applications logged in and date/time stamped the same day and time they were received in the Application Master Log
			<b>NOTE:</b> The log must be typed, and funding, applications late and/or rejected certified. The log is an official document and must be complete and legible
7	_____	_____	Receipted for original and three identical copies of the original application validated against the Application Master Log

**NOTE:** Checked to ensure all

			applications are complete. Designate and file original as control copy
8	_____	_____	If applicable, applications not in local jurisdiction transferred by <b><u>OVERNIGHT MAIL</u></b>
9	_____	_____	Application Master Log faxed to OCPS
10	_____	_____	Application general data entered into data module from section 1 of the application screening checklist
11	_____	_____	Applications screened for technical deficiencies
12	_____	_____	Acknowledgment letter/technical deficiency letters sent to applicants
13	_____	_____	Selective criterion 3 and 4 were scored <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Provided reviewer with assigned applications and score sheets</li> <li>B. Reviewer assignment sheet, listed all applications assigned to reviewer</li> </ul>
14	_____	_____	Reviewer scored each application selective criterion 3 and 4. Reviewer entered the score on both score sheets and attached score sheets and any other relative documents to application. Reviewer used hand held calculators to verify computations. Reviewers printed all comments.
15	_____	_____	If applicable, all technical deficiency(ies) received materials from housing authorities
16	_____	_____	Reviewer returned applications and completed score sheets to the FOGA. The reviewer assignment sheet was initialed by the FOGA to indicate receipt of the application.
17	_____	_____	FOGA checked score sheets for

completeness, validates scores and signed score sheet to confirm validation. Errors found were corrected by the reviewer in all cases and initialed.

- |    |       |       |  |
|----|-------|-------|--|
| 18 | _____ | _____ | Applications were controlled and accounted for at all times during this process.   |
| 19 | _____ | _____ | Completed application screening sheet/ score sheets, and other related documents   |
| 20 | _____ | _____ | FO application process completed   |
| 21 | _____ | _____ | Mailed boxes with applications, with associated materials that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. Transmittal letter. The transmittal letter must identify the number of boxes, applications shipped and listing of all ineligible applications with reason for rejection.</li><li>B. Application Master Log and Correctable Deficiency Log with any ineligible applications -- identified and reason listed for rejection;</li><li>C. Application screening documents, and score sheets. A completed score sheet must be attached to each application with selective criterion 3 and 4 scores entered on each score sheet. Curable deficiency letters, corrections, must be attached to the application.</li><li>D. Organize and pack applications. Organized by HA Code sequence with HA Code printed in 2" high with <b>PERMANENT MARKER</b> on outside upper right hand corner of each application.</li></ul> |

- E. Diskette of application information from the SMIRPH (public housing authorities)/and or MIRS (Indian housing authorities) Grants Management Module. FOs ensured project summaries were entered, in English, with upper and lower case lettering
- F. For APC management purposes numbered all boxes and placed transmittal letter, Master Application Log, Correctable Deficiency Log and diskette in box # 1.

22        \_\_\_\_\_        \_\_\_\_\_        All applications will be sent "overnight mail - contracted or non-contracted" to the APC. Checked with administrative officer and mail room supervisor for guidance regarding this matter.

23        \_\_\_\_\_        \_\_\_\_\_        Application boxes were shipped to the Sheraton Washington Hotel, 2660 Woodley Road, Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008 to arrive by September 5, 1997, 3:00pm EST.

**Special shipping instructions were as follows:** Sheraton Washington Hotel - Shipping and Receiving Department, HUD Grant Review, September 5 - 19, 1997, Attention: Deborah K. Tritle, Melissa Erie and Ray Johnson. Phone number (202) 328-2000.

24        \_\_\_\_\_        \_\_\_\_\_        Sent urgent cc:mail to the APC and OCPS (Attention Malcolm E. Main, PIH POST2) that stated "when" and "how" the applications were shipped and "expected arrival date."

FOGA Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Field Office: \_\_\_\_\_

Specific comments by FOGA (Use additional paper if necessary):

APPENDIX 3:      FY 1997 PHDEP FIELD OFFICE GRANT APPLICATION CORRECTABLE DEFICIENCIES  
MASTER LOG

[illegible]

Field Office \_\_\_\_\_ FOGA name: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX 4:       SAMPLE FY 1997 PHDEP FIELD OFFICE GRANT  
APPLICATION DEFICIENCY LETTER  
SAMPLE - ONLY**

Applicant  
Address

Dear Executive Director (Name):

Thank you for your recent application submission for the FY 1997 Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP). The (Name of Local HUD Field Office) has conducted the initial screening of your application. Your submission was found technically deficient in the following areas:

(SAMPLE)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Please provide the additional information and/or corrected certification(s) for the identified deficiencies within 14 days from the date of this letter. Please submit your corrections to:

Name of Local Field Office  
Address  
Name of contact person  
Phone Number  
Fax Number

If you have any questions, please contact (Insert contact name and phone number).

Thank you for your interest in the Department's programs.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX 5:       FY 1997 PHDEP FIELD OFFICE GRANT APPLICATION  
                  SELECTIVE CRITERIA 3 and 4 -- "HIGH", "MEDIUM",  
                  AND "LOW" SCORER GUIDANCE

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER "HIGH," "MEDIUM," "LOW," POINT DISTRIBUTION

Below is a **guide** given to each reviewer to help illustrate the scoring criteria for selective criteria 3 and 4 of the PHDEP grant application. The criterion is broken into three different point categories on what would constitute a **"High", "Medium", and "Low" score**. In reviewing an application, reviewers will find that it does not fall neatly into one of these categories, based on the text provided. Refer to the FY 97 PHDEP NOFA for the complete scoring selective criteria.

**THIRD SELECTIVE CRITERION. THE CAPABILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO CARRY OUT THE PLAN. MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE POINTS FOR SELECTIVE CRITERION 3: 15 POINTS**

**SUBFACTOR 3-A SECTION I.(d)(3)(i)(A)(B)(C) AND (D) OF THE NOFA  
MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 4**

**HIGH POINTS (3-4 POINTS)**

The applicant **CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED A CAPABILITY** to effectively and efficiently manage their housing developments as outlined in reports generated by HUD reviews or audits.

**MEDIUM POINTS (1-2 POINTS)**

The applicant demonstrated satisfactory **FAIR ABILITY** to effectively and efficiently manage their housing developments as outlined in reports generated by HUD reviews or audits.

**LOW POINTS (0 POINTS)**

The applicant demonstrated a **LACK OF ABILITY** to manage their housing developments as shown in HUD reviews and audits through unresolved findings and observations.

**SUBFACTOR 3-B SECTION I.(d)(3)(ii) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL  
POINTS: 2**



#### **HIGH POINTS (2 POINTS)**

The applicant **HAS IMPLEMENTED** thorough policies, practices and procedures to effectively screen potential residents, reduce vacancies and to evict those residents involved with illegal drug activities. These policies, practices and procedures **HAVE DEMONSTRATED** a significant reduction in drug-related problems in the housing authority developments or has maintained a low level of drug-related crime.

#### **MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT)**

The applicant implemented **SOME** policies, practices and procedures to screen potential residents, reduce vacancies and to evict those residents involved with illegal drug activities. These policies, practices **HAVE DEMONSTRATED SOME** measurable reduction in drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in the housing authority developments.

#### **LOW POINTS (0 POINTS)**

The applicant **HAS NOT IMPLEMENTED** policies, practices and a procedure to screen potential residents, reduce vacancies or to evict those residents involved with illegal drug activities or the applicant's management policies **HAVE NOT SHOWN** to have had an impact on the reduction of drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in the housing authority developments.

**SUBFACTOR 3-C SECTION I.(d)(3)(iii) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 4**

#### **HIGH POINTS (3-4 POINTS)**

The applicant's previous and/or current (past three years) PHDEP grant(s) have been **SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED WITH MAJOR RESULTS**. The program has demonstrated success through:

1. Timely execution of contracts with local police authorities for law enforcement services.
2. Established and tracked indicators to measure program success.

3. Managed and implemented program(s) on time based on the application timetable.
4. During the immediate past FY, the applicant, as part of program implementation, has demonstrated resident participation and community involvement/partnerships.
5. Funds draw down were obligated and expended consistent with program implementation work plan and timeline.
6. Semiannual and final performance and financial reports complete and submitted in a timely manner.
7. Evaluation reports of previous PHDEPs are detailed and reflect a significant improvement in program goals and/or outcomes crime reduction.

#### **MEDIUM POINTS (1-2 POINTS)**

The applicant's previous and/or current (past three years) PHDEP grant(s) have been **SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED WITH SOME RESULTS**. The program has demonstrated documented some success through:

1. Execution of contracts with local police authorities for law enforcement services with some results.
2. Established and tracked indicators to measure program with some documented success.
3. Managed and implemented program(s) were on time, some of the time, based upon the application timetable. The applicant modified timelines (extension/waiver of regulation) with some success.
4. During the immediate past FY, the applicant, as part of program implementation, has demonstrated some resident participation and community involvement/partnerships.
5. Drawdown of funds were obligated and expended most of the time.
6. Semiannual and final performance and financial reports were complete with some results and submitted in a timely manner.

#### **LOW POINTS (0 POINTS)**

The applicant's previous and/or current (past three years) PHDEP

grant(s) **WERE IMPLEMENTED**. The program has demonstrated with difficulty through:

1. Contract has not been executed with local police authorities for services.
2. Did not implement the program(s) on time (based upon the application timetable) and requested untimely extensions.
3. During the immediate past FY, the applicant, as part of program implementation, solicited some resident participation and community involvement/partnerships.
4. Drawdown of funds were rarely obligated and expended on time. There is evidence that grantee rarely draws down from LOCCS, utilized other HUD funds and/or there is evidence of co-mingling of funds.
5. Semiannual and final performance and financial reports were completed and submitted most of the time with a lack of performance in results in crime reduction.
6. Evaluation reports of previous PHDEPs not submitted or were sketchy and reflected no improvement in reduction of drug-related crime.
7. Semiannual and final performance and financial reports were not submitted.

**SUBFACTOR 3-C SECTION I.(d)(3)(iv) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 5**

**HIGH POINTS (4-5 POINTS)**

The applicant's plan **CLEARLY DOCUMENTS** the relationship between the extent of the crime detailed in Selection Criterion I, section I.(d)(1) of grants during the preceding years, and outcomes regarding reducing/eliminating drug-related crime described in the implementation of the plans and timetables, timely draw down of funding which corresponds to the timetable of proposed activities, achievement of goals outlined in previous PHDEP and/or other HUD program semiannual and final performance and financial reports, audits, and performance outcome measures in drug and crime activities at previously targeted developments.

**MEDIUM POINTS (2-3 POINTS)**

The applicant's plan satisfactorily **FAIRLY DOCUMENTS** the relationship between the extent of the crime detailed in Selection Criterion I, section I.(d)(1) of grants during the preceding years, and outcomes regarding reducing and eliminating drug-related crime described in the implementation of the plans and timetables; drawdown of funds were obligated and expended **MOST** of the time; applicant achieved some of the goals outlined in previous PHDEP and/or other HUD semiannual and final program performance and financial reports, audits, and performance outcome measured in drug and crime activities at previously targeted developments.

**LOW POINTS (0-1 POINT)**

The applicant's plan provided **LITTLE OR NO DOCUMENTATION** regarding the relationship between the extent of the crime detailed in Selection Criterion I, section I.(d)(1) of grants during the preceding years, and outcomes regarding reducing and eliminating drug-related crime described in the implementation of the plans and timetables; drawdown of funds **WERE NOT** obligated or expended in a timely manner; applicant achieved **FEW OR NONE** of the goals outlined in previous PHDEP and/or other HUD semiannual and final program performance and financial reports, audits, and performance outcome measured in drug and crime activities at previously targeted developments.

**FOURTH SELECTIVE CRITERION. THE EXTENT TO WHICH TENANTS, THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND PARTICIPATE IN THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTIVITIES PROPOSED TO BE FUNDED UNDER THE APPLICATION. MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE POINTS FOR SELECTIVE CRITERION 4: 15 POINTS**

**SUBFACTOR 4-A SECTION I.(d)(4)(i)(ii) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 5**

**HIGH POINTS (4-5 POINTS)**

The applicant **CLEARLY DOCUMENTS** the extent to which community representative and local government officials were actively involved in the design and implementation of the applicant's plan, through a summary of the participants involvement, meeting minutes, letters of commitment to provide funding, staff, or in-kind resources, or written comments on the applicants planned activities.

**MEDIUM POINTS (1-3 POINTS)**

The applicant provides **SOME DOCUMENTATION** as to the extent to which the community representatives and local government officials were involved in the design and implementation of the applicant's plan.

**LOW POINTS (0 POINTS)**

The applicant has **NO DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE** of the extent to which community representatives and local government officials were involved in the design and implementation of the applicant's plan.

**SUBFACTOR 4-B SECTION I.(d)(4)(iii) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 4**

**HIGH POINTS (3-4 POINTS)**

The applicant discussed and provided certification and **CLEARLY DOCUMENTED** the activities and obligations currently being met by law enforcement under the cooperation agreement. The application **CLEARLY DESCRIBED** the current level of law enforcement services being provided to the development proposed for assistance.

**MEDIUM POINTS (1-2 POINTS)**

The applicant provided certification and **LIMITED DOCUMENTATION** that obligations are being met by law enforcement services. The application **DID NOT CLEARLY DESCRIBE** the current level of law enforcement services being provided to the developments proposed for assistance.

**LOW POINTS (0 POINTS)**

The applicant provided certification but **NO DOCUMENTATION** regarding the obligations under the cooperation. The application **DID NOT DESCRIBE** the current level of law enforcement services being provided to the developments proposed for assistance.

**SUBFACTOR 4-C SECTION I.(d)(4)(iv) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 3**

**HIGH POINTS (3 POINTS)**

The applicant **CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES AND DOCUMENTS** the active involvement of residents and resident organizations in the planning and development of the grant application and plan strategy. The applicant provides a **CLEAR SUMMARY** of each written

resident and resident organization comments, and the applicant's response to and action on these comments.

**MEDIUM POINTS (1-2 POINTS)**

The applicant provides **SOME EVIDENCE** of the involvement of residents and resident organizations in the planning and development of the grant application and plan strategy

**LOW POINTS (0 POINTS)**

The applicant **DID NOT DEMONSTRATE OR DOCUMENT** the involvement of residents and resident organization in the planning and development of the grant application and plan strategy.

**SUBFACTOR 4-D SECTION I.(d)(4)(v) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 3**

**HIGH POINTS (3 POINTS)**

The applicant **CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED** that it is already participating in local, State, or Federal anti-drug related crime efforts (such as Operation Weed and Seed, coordinated by the U.S. Department of Justice, Operation Safe Home, or other programs) or **IS SUCCESSFULLY** coordinating its law enforcement activities with local, state or federal law enforcement agencies.

**MEDIUM POINTS (1-2 POINTS)**

The applicant **DEMONSTRATED** that it is undertaking, or has undertaken, participation in local, State, or federal anti-drug related crime efforts as mentioned above or **IS SUCCESSFULLY** coordinating its law enforcement activities with local, State, Tribal or Federal law enforcement agencies.

**LOW POINTS (0 POINTS)**

The applicant **FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE** that it is already undertaking, or has undertaken, participation in local, State, or Federal anti-drug related crime efforts as mentioned above or is successfully coordinating its law enforcement activities with local, state, Tribal or federal law enforcement agencies.

**HUD FIELD STAFF TRAINING -- ATTENDANCE ROSTER**

Subject: FY 1997 PHDEP Application Reviewer Training

FO: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of training: \_\_\_\_\_

The following HUD staff attended the FY 1997 PHDEP Application Reviewer Training.

#	NAME
1.	_____
2.	_____
3	_____
4.	_____
5.	_____
6.	_____
7.	_____
8.	_____
9.	_____
10.	_____

FOGA signature:\_\_\_\_\_

## HUD REFORM ACT PROVISIONS - FOR REVIEWERS

The HUD Reform Act of 1989 prohibits any applicant from gaining an advantage in the competition as a result of receiving confidential information. The final rule, (24 CFR part 4) "Prohibition of Advance Disclosure of Funding Decisions," which implements section 103 of the Reform Act, specifically prohibits advance disclosure of the following:

- (1) Information regarding an applicant's relative standing;
- (2) The amount of assistance requested by any other applicant;
- (3) The identity of any other applicant;
- (4) The number of applications; and
- (5) Any other information contained in another application.

I understand the provisions of this regulation.

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date:\_\_\_\_\_



## FY 1997 PHDEP FIELD OFFICE REVIEWER APPLICATION LOG

REVIEWER NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]



**APPENDIX 6:       FY 1997 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION SELECTIVE CRITERIA  
3 AND 4 SCORING SHEET AND RELATED DOCUMENTS**

Each reviewer will receive a number of assigned FY 1997 PHDEP grant applications to review and score. These applications will be listed on the application assignment sheet accompanying the applications. Please check to verify the receipt of all applications listed and sign the sheet as confirmation.

The reviewer is responsible for the applications in at all times. Return each application to the supervisor as you complete the review and scoring of each application. Review the applications in the order listed on your assignment sheet.

Applications are to be reviewed and scored according to the FY 97 NOFA, OMB Circular A-87, the FY 97 Application Processing Notice and any additional instructions issued by the OCPS.

Reviewers must give reasons for scores, expressed in strengths and weaknesses. Comments must be useful, clear, significant, accurate, and logical. Include the applicant's application tab/page numbers regarding comments. If needed, use and attach a blank sheet of paper to complete your comments. Do not write on the back of pages. Print all comments.

Requirements for writing comments: use black ink, write legibly, use complete sentences, use proper grammar and spelling, include the application's page for each comment, be specific, detailed and concise, be tactful, justify each strength and weakness and document your evaluation. All of the documents used during the process are official documents and are subject to review. Therefore, all documents must be legible and scorers must document decisions completely and accurately. Reviewers must print all comments.

The number of points that an application receives must depend on the extent to which the application is responsive to the information requested in the selection criteria.

As the reviewer scores each selective criterion they must post the scores on the score sheet. All scores must be justified and verified by a supervisor.

Points are awarded based on the extent to which an applicant is responsive to the information requested in the selection criterion. An application must receive a score of at least 70 points out of a maximum of 100 points that may be awarded under this competition to be eligible for funding.

All of the documents used during the process are official documents and are subject to review. Therefore, all documents must be legible and scorers must document decisions completely and accurately.

If appropriate, comment on the following issues and mark with the appropriate letter in the upper right hand corner of the score sheet:

- A. **INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES - "I".** If the reviewer identifies ineligible activities listed in the grant, circle the item in the text. List the activity and tab/page number under "Ineligible Activities" on the score sheet. Deduct the amount of the funding required for the ineligible item from the total requested budget to reflect total approved budget. The supervisor will reconcile the amount to be deducted with the second reviewer prior to data entry.
- B. **ALCOHOL/PRESCRIPTION DRUGS - "A" OR "P".** If the applicant describes its primary substance abuse problem as alcohol or prescription drug abuse, the reviewer will note this on the application and appropriate scorer page. These activities will be identified as ineligible and deducted as referenced above.

Enter grant amount requested minus, if applicable, the amount of any ineligible activities to show a revised recommended grant funding. If there are any activities that are not clear, note them and request clarification prior to recommending funding.

All score sheets must be signed by the reviewer and verified by the supervisor. Verify all scores with a calculator.

Part 1 of the application score sheet will be managed by APC staff. Note it is not part of your score sheet. Reviewers will complete Part II-A and II-B of the score sheet. Reviewers must attach Part II-A and II-B to each application.

**FY 1997 PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING  
DRUG ELIMINATION GRANT PROGRAM**

**OFFICE OF CRIME PREVENTION AND SECURITY  
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND INVOLVEMENT  
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**REVIEWER SCORING FORM PART II-A**

HA Legal Name \_\_\_\_\_

HA Code \_\_\_\_\_ FO Code \_\_\_\_\_

Designated FO \_\_\_\_\_

Funds Requested: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Projected Funds Approved: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

---

***\*\*PLEASE USE BLACK INK\*\****

<b>Selective Criteria</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
3	15	_____

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

FOGA Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**FY 1997 PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING  
DRUG ELIMINATION GRANT PROGRAM**

**OFFICE OF CRIME PREVENTION AND SECURITY  
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND INVOLVEMENT  
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**REVIEWER SCORING FORM PART II-B**

HA Legal Name \_\_\_\_\_

HA Code \_\_\_\_\_ FO Code \_\_\_\_\_

Designated FO \_\_\_\_\_

Funds Requested: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Projected Funds Approved: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

---

***\*\*PLEASE USE BLACK INK\*\****

<b>Selective Criteria</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
-------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

4	15	_____
---	----	-------

Secretary's Representative Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**HA LEGAL NAME:**

### Total Score

[illegible][illegible]





**FY 1997 PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING  
DRUG ELIMINATION GRANT PROGRAM**

**OFFICE OF CRIME PREVENTION AND SECURITY  
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND INVOLVEMENT  
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**SCORING FORM WORKSHEETS  
(ATTACH TO EACH SCORE SHEET)**

**SECTION 1. FINAL BUDGET DATA INPUT SHEET. COMPLETED BY FO AND APC STAFF.**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>FO FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>APC APPROVED AMOUNT</b>
9110	Reimbursement of Law Enforcement	\$_____	\$_____
	1. Dedicated PH Division/ Bureau	\$_____	\$_____
	<b>(TOTAL 9110 BLI FUNDING)</b>	\$_____	\$_____
9120	Employment of Security Personnel		
	1. HA employed Security Guards	\$_____	\$_____
	2. Contracted Security Gds	\$_____	\$_____
	3. HA Police Departments	\$_____	\$_____
	<b>(TOTAL 9120 BLI FUNDING)</b>	\$_____	\$_____
9130	Employment of Investigators	\$_____	\$_____
9140	Voluntary Tenant Patrols	\$_____	\$_____
9150	Physical Improvements	\$_____	\$_____

**PROGRAMS TO REDUCE ILLEGAL DRUGS**

9160	Drug Prevention	\$_____	\$_____
9170	Drug Intervention	\$_____	\$_____
9180	Drug Treatment	\$_____	\$_____

**GRANT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS**

9190	Other Program Costs	\$_____	\$_____
------	---------------------	---------	---------

**TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED** \$\_\_\_\_\_

If applicable, total funding after adjustments \$\_\_\_\_\_

FOGA Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

APC Panel Leader Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION 2. FY 1997 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES. IF APPLICABLE, COMPLETED BY FO AND APC STAFF.**

The reviewer(s) must list any ineligible items by activity and cost objective from budget and deduct from the requested funding amount. All deductions must be justified with comment by the scorer and verified by a panel leader.

<b>INELIGIBLE ACTIVITY OR COST</b>	<b>AMOUNT DEDUCTED</b>	<b>TAB # PAGE #</b>	<b>REVIEWER JUSTIFICATION FOR DEDUCTION</b>
--	----------------------------	-------------------------	---

**SECTION 3. IF APPLICABLE, SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO GRANT AGREEMENT (FORM HUD-1044). COMPLETED BY FO HUD AND APC STAFF.**